

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

<hr/>)	
DANIEL KEATING, Individually and)		
as PRESIDENT OF NEWPORT POLO, INC.,)		
)		
Plaintiff,)		
v.)	C.A. No. 11-179S	
)		
DIAMOND STATE INSURANCE CO.,)		
)		
Defendant.)		
<hr/>)	

ORDER


WILLIAM E. SMITH, United States District Judge.

On September 24, 2012, Plaintiff Daniel Keating, individually and as president of Newport Polo, Inc., filed an Objection (ECF No. 29) to Magistrate Judge Lincoln D. Almond's Report and Recommendation filed September 10, 2012 (ECF No. 26) recommending that the Court grant Defendant Diamond State Insurance Co.'s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 12). The Objection was a general objection which explained that a more detailed objection would be forthcoming. In the interim, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Reconsideration before Judge Almond (ECF No. 32) and thus requested, and was granted, five extensions of time (ECF Nos. 28, 31, 35, 36, and 37, respectively) to file his Objection. Judge Almond denied the Motion for Reconsideration on February 20, 2013 (ECF No. 38), and Plaintiff's Fifth Extension of Time expired on March 17,

2013 (See Text Order docketed on February 22, 2013). Plaintiff has failed to file a more detailed Objection to the Report and Recommendation or to request a sixth extension of time. The Court, therefore, reviews the Report and Recommendation under a clear error standard. See Seymour v. Cont'l Airlines, Inc., No. 09-526-ML, 2010 WL 3894023, at *1 (D.R.I. Oct. 4, 2010) ("To the extent that objections 'amount to no more than general or conclusory objections' . . . a de-novo review is unwarranted and this Court need only review the Report and Recommendation for clear error." (quoting Espada-Santiago v. Hosp. Episcopal San Lucas, Civil No. 07-2221(ADC), 2009 WL 702350, at *1 (D.P.R. Mar. 11, 2009))).

The Court has reviewed Judge Almond's findings and legal reasoning, determining that because they are well supported by both the facts and the law, the Report and Recommendation easily satisfies the clear error standard. Plaintiff's Objection, therefore, is DENIED. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Report and Recommendation is hereby accepted, and, accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



William E. Smith
United States District Judge
Date: 4/9/13